## AC

Rehab is inevitable. Absent Pell Grants, it will be religious rehab which non-uniques disads but doesn’t solve crime. **Lockard 12**[[1]](#footnote-1)

This is a world to which the recently deceased Charles Colson contributed greatly, one where true knowledge comes from the bible, the Book of Mormon, and a few other holy texts. The awards dinner featured a solid contingent of Colson’s Prison Fellowship volunteers. Organized religious missions have been coming to prisons since the late eighteenth century, when the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Prisonssent mostly Quaker volunteers to Walnut Street Jail. Throughout the nineteenth and into the twentieth century US **prisons were sites of religious predation**, primarily led by Christian evangelicals. Limited efforts at educational modernization through **secular** post-secondary academic **programs came to a halt with the** 1994 **ban on Pell grants** for prisoners, legislation that had profoundly counter-productive effects. Colson’s growing success at **prison evangelization** programs **coincided with** the **gutting of higher education** opportunities in prisons. But despite enjoying a law career based on the advantages of an Ivy League undergraduate education, Colson disliked higher education as a diversion from spiritual pursuits. He had no use for contemporary intellectual debates, dismissing them as “the big lie of post-modernism” that distracted from rock-solid faith in Jesus as savior. In God and Government, Colson attacked the Enlightenment as a source of a mistaken understanding of human nature that led to a disastrous pursuit of social utopianism. He denounced universities as centers of moral relativism unfit to educate students who needed guidance toward moral authority. Colson’s vision of prison ministries corresponded with what he believed lacking from secular education – a Christ-centered path to improvement of self and society. Although he adopted the language of marginalization and oppression in describing prison inmates, Colson believed that address to the social origins of crime lay in spirituality rather than education that addressed the material world. Nowhere in his extensive writings does Colson engage with Pell grants and the disappearance of higher education from prisons. The politics that Colson advocated remained as deeply reactionary after his prison sentence as before. Rather, his experience combined with a new Christian evangelism added a coloration of social care that had been absent. His very popular and much-reprinted autobiography, Born Again, is filled with recounted political dialogue in White House offices and details of conversion and Christian fellowship found among Washington insiders. He views himself as an instrument in the Lord’s hands, unconscious before his downfall and conscious afterwards. “What happened in court today,” he said to the press after sentencing, “was the court’s will and the Lord’s will—I have committed my life to Jesus Christ and I can work for Him in prison as well as out.” The state, its institutions, and legal decisions in Colson’s view coincided with and remained subordinate to his own interpretation of Christian redemption. Born Again contains no condemnation of the lack of fellowship in Nixon’s racist Southern strategy, and has only praise for his president’s decision to bomb North Vietnam and prosecute the US genocide in south-east Asia. Ironically, it was the illegality of Colson’s obstruction of justice concerning a conspiracy against Daniel Ellsberg for his Pentagon Papers revelations about Vietnam that led to a seven-month prison sentence. In Colson’s version of his life story, his mistake lay in the hubris of ignoring God while in the White House. The rest of his life was repentance and corrective spiritual action, which he construed to include anti-Darwinism, opposition to gay and lesbian rights, and an array of reactionary causes. Another reading of Colson’s life is that he remained a faithful servant of the state, one who successfully advocated spiritual submission for prisoners rather than an education that would enable them to critique society more acutely and pursue intellectual self-reliance. The Prison Fellowship Ministries collaborate with prison administrations to operate a private-public partnership for obscurantism by missionizing a captive population. Such work with a domestic underclass recapitulates historic Euro-american imperialism’s combination of state and religious power to produce passive laboring subjects. The carceral state values narratives that confess sin, embrace salvational repentance, and advocate compliance with an ordained social order. Such narratives gain official sanction because, as Tanya Erzen argues, “Personal narratives of individual transformation are central to testimonial politics, and they work in conjunction with a neoliberal vision in which social services are privatized rather than funded by the federal government…Testimonial politics support the **faith-based policies** of economic privatization that **place the onus for solving social problems on the individual and** on the power of God to transform lives.” Colson modeled the compliant subject, entirely unlike the resistant prison narratives of Jimmy Santiago Baca. For Colson, a prisoner needed to learn social conformity alongside Christian submission. Prison was a place to ask questions only of oneself, not about society. Colson **did not challenge the massive growth of US prisons** since he served time in the 1970s or the role of the drug wars in fueling that growth. The entanglement of state and religion that Colson pursued resulted in a 2007 Eighth Circuit decision,Americans United for Separation of Church and State v. Prison Fellowship Ministries, which sustained a lower court decision striking down a state-funded Fellowship-run InnerChange Freedom Initiative re-entry program in Iowa prisons that employed Bible counselors and evangelical Christian programming. Although the Iowa program no longer exists, it still functions in Minnesota and Texas. Colson’s efforts to foster Christian evangelism on taxpayer money, a clear breach of the Establishment Clause, are withering. Where he has succeeded is in bringing volunteers into prisons to do the same work free of charge, where they preach personal faith instead of educate. There are social costs in ignoring the profoundly life-altering potential of higher education. Colson’s post-Watergate career was dedicated to a blinkered Bible-centered vision of salvation and individual transformation in prisons, a vision that attached no importance to a broad humanities and sciences education. It is a legacy that needs undoing.

**Thus the Plan**: The USFG ought to grant access to Pell Grants to inmates in the United States criminal justice system.

Funding through normal means. No legal violations link because affirming means amending the laws to make the aff world consistent with them.

Advantage 1 is Crime

Pell Grants rehabilitate prisoners which solves crime and poverty. Empirics prove. **Buzzini 9**[[2]](#footnote-2)

[Brackets in original text] It’s no secret that the education system in the United States is in shambles – and not just for inmates. Students aren’t receiving a proper education, which encourages the nation’s youth to get involved in gangs, drugs, and violence. **Many inmates can’t** even **read well, ranking** in **at** “maybe a **seventh-grade level**” (Leder 1). **Were it possible** for inmates **to receive a**n education while serving time (a GED if an equivalent had not been attained, followed by a post-secondary **degree**) **they would have a much greater chance of escaping** the clutches of **poverty and** their ties to **illegal activity when** they are **released** back into society. This must have been the line of thinking that inspired the inception of the first post-secondary correctional education program, which began in 1953 at the University of Southern Illinois in Menard. Such a program must have been a bit ahead of its time, because **by 1965 only 11** more post-secondary correctional **education** (PCSE) **programs appeared.** 19**65** was a landmark year for PCSE it **marked the first** time that inmates were eligible to receive **Pell Grants** to fund their college aspirations. **Thanks to** the availability of **federal funding, programs began popping up nationwide.** In 1973 there were 182 programs; by 1982 there were 350. Programs reached their peak when, **in the** early 19**90s, there were** a total of **772** on-site college programs **in 1,287 prisons** (Taylor “Pell Grants” 2). **The majority of inmates covered their costs with** the aid of **the Pell Grant. However, in** 19**94, thanks to** the prevailing **“tough on crime” attitude** of the time, **inmates** were **no longer** able to **receive** federal aid in the form of **Pell Grants.** While peak enrollment in PCSE programs totaled at 12 percent of inmate populations, the s0-called “deteriorated state” counted less than 4 percent (Taylor “Pell Grants” 3). There is **myriad statistical data** to **show that education programs** inside prisons **aid in** actual **rehab**ilitation **and** do **reduce recidivism** rates. But these facts were glossed over as politicians wowed their constituents with their tough policies regarding crime. However, they didn’t bother to mention to their constituents that “**Massachusetts, Maryland, and New York** are among the states [that **reported**] **reductions in recidivism of** as high as **15.5 percent for inmates** who participated **in education programs** (Freedman 6).” That 15.5 percent reduction means 15.5 percent of inmates were *actually* rehabilitated, as opposed to merely punished, during their time on the inside. The numbers are even more impressive on a national scale, as “**inmates with** at least two years of **college had a 10 percent re-arrest rate; the national average is 60 percent**” (“Statehouses Debate…”). That means 50 percent less people went back to prison, simply because they completed some form of higher education. It is for reasons such as this that “critics lament the loss of **Pell Grants** as short-sighted in light of studies documenting **lower recidivism** and misconduct rates among inmates who pursue post-secondary education” (Freedman 8). It truly is a serious loss, for the depletion of funding via Pell Grants for PSCE has resulted in a devastating loss of programs nationwide, despite such programs’ ability to reduce recidivism **and** markedly **rehabilitate** many **inmates who participate.** Should the Pell Grant be re-instated, corrections in America would see a much-needed turn for the better.

Poverty causes nuclear war. **Caldwell 03**[[3]](#footnote-3)

It would appear that global nuclear war will happen very soon, for two main reasons, alluded to above. First, human poverty and misery are [is] increasing at an incredible rate. There are now three billion more desperately poor people on the planet than there were just forty years ago. **Despite decades of industrial development, the number of** wretchedly **poor people continues to soar.** The pressure for war mounts as the population explodes. Second, **war is motivated by** resource scarcity -- **the desire of one group to acquire the land, water, energy, or other resources possessed by another.** **With each passing year, crowding and misery increase, raising the motivation for war to higher levels.**

Crime kills soft power. **Falk 12**[[4]](#footnote-4)

This unabashed avowal of imperial goals is the main thesis of the article, perhaps most graphically expressed in the following words: "The United States can increase the effectiveness of its military forces and make the world safe for soft power, America's inherent comparative advantage." As the glove fits the hand, **soft power** complements hard power within the wider enterprise of transforming the world in the United States' image, or at least in the ideal version of the United States' sense of self.

The authors acknowledge (rather parenthetically) that their strategy **may not work if the US continues** much longer **to be seen unfavourably abroad as a national abode of** drugs, **crime, [and] violence**, fiscal irresponsibility, family breakdown, and political gridlock. **They make a** rather meaningless **plea to restore "a** **healthy democracy" at home as a prelude to** the heavy lifting of **democratising the world, but they** do not pretend medical knowledge, and **offer no prescriptions for restoring the health of the American body politic.** And now, 16 years after their article appeared, it would appear that the adage, "disease unknown, cure unknown", applies.

Soft power solves multiple scenarios for extinction. **Nye and Armitage 07**[[5]](#footnote-5)

Soft power is the ability to attract people to our side without coercion. Legitimacy is central to soft power. **If a** people or **nation believes American objectives to be legitimate, we are more likely to persuade them to follow our lead** without using threats and bribes. **Legitimacy can also reduce opposition to**—and the costs of—**using hard power when the situation demands.** Appealing to others’ values, interests, and preferences can, in certain circumstances, replace the dependence on carrots and sticks. Cooperation is always a matter of degree, and it is profoundly influenced by attraction…The information age has heightened political consciousness, but also made political groupings less cohesive. Small, adaptable, transnational networks have access to tools of destruction that are increasingly cheap, easy to conceal, and more readily available. Although the integration of the global economy has brought tremendous benefits, **threats such as pandemic disease and the collapse of financial markets are more distributed and more likely to arise without warning. The threat of** widespread physical harm to the planet posed by **nuclear catastrophe** has existed for half a century, though the realization of the threat **will become more likely as the number of nuclear weapons states increases.** The potential security challenges posed by **climate change raise[s]** the possibility of an entirely **new** set of **threats** for the United States **to consider**… **States** and non-state actors who improve their ability to draw in allies will gain competitive advantages in today’s environment. Those **who alienate potential friends will stand at greater risk.** China has invested in its soft power to ensure access to resources and to ensure against efforts to undermine its military modernization. **Terrorists depend on** their ability to attract **support from the crowd** at least as much as their ability to destroy the enemy’s will to fight.

Advantage 2 is Air Power

Aerospace industry is declining now due to lack of skilled workers. Increase in community college or vocational training would solve. **Koopmans 12**[[6]](#footnote-6)

SEATTLE - Boeing has a big job ahead - after last week's announcement of airplane orders and commitments worth billions of dollars. Now, **as thousands of aerospace workers prepare to retire,** U.S. **Sen.** Maria **Cantwell** is wondering where the skilled workers will come from to build those planes. During a tour of Machinists Inc., a precision machining company and Boeing supplier in Seattle, Cantwell announced she will be holding a Senate Aviation Subcommittee hearing this week on aviation competitiveness in Washington, D.C. “Over the next 20 years, the aerospace industry is expected to grow by more than $3 trillion,” said Cantwell. “I’m bringing together aviation and aerospace leaders to talk about what they think must be done for the U.S. to remain on top of these industries.”Machinists Inc. is one of hundreds of local manufacturers that will help Boeing reach its goals. The plant will help make parts for the 396 planes Boeing took orders for last week. "Today we're here to make sure that the work force is there to help produce those planes," she said Sunday during her tour of the plant. Cantwell **says 21,000 aerospace workers will be needed over the next decade to keep up with international competitors.**"We want to remain the center of aerospace manufacturing here in the Northwest, so we want to really focus on what we're going to do to get a lot more people interested," she said. To make her point, Cantwell focuses on the numbers.  "**Half of the Boeing work force will be eligible to retire in five to seven years**, meaning that's when there will be a big demand for workers," she says. She says **getting workers in takes** a three-pronged approach.  The first is getting is children interested in aerospace early. Second is **getting the unemployed trained through community and technical colleges.** And third, attracting technically trained veterans as they return from war.  All that and more will be discussed at Cantwell's hearing, scheduled for Wednesday on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C. The hearing will include testimony from John J. Tracy, chief technology officer for the Boeing Co.; Stan Sorscher of SPEEA; Dan Elwell, senior vice president of Aerospace Industries Association; Nick Calio, president and CEO of Airlines for America; and Pete Bunce, president and CEO of General Aviation Manufacturers Association.

Pell Grants incentivize prison community college and vocational programs which teach key tech skills. **Young 11**[[7]](#footnote-7)

Partnerships between corrections and community colleges with their links to business and industry were once common. **Until the mid-1990’s community colleges provided** large numbers of **prisoners** with **post-secondary education** and vocational training. Their programming was shown to reduce recidivism and increased returning inmates’ employment and earning power. 21 **But Pell grants** and other federal sources **that supported community college programs categorically dried up** as the result of changes in the law in the late 1990’s. 22 During the academic year 2009-2010 only 6% of all state prisoners enrolled in vocational or academic postsecondary programs and of these 86% were concentrated in just 13 states. 23 States such as Illinois that still provide community college instruction for prisoners do so with support from one or another combination of line items in the state corrections budget, student head-count funds provided to participating community colleges, or state financial aid, 24 funding that is no more likely to increase in the near future than is funding for other correctional programs. **The federal gov**ernment **could still** provide needed **support** for **a strong community college role in reentry.** In recent years **the Department of Labor awarded community colleges substantial grants for training in tech**nological **fields** such as nuclear and renewable energy, “green” retrofitting and cyber security. 25 The Program for **Prison** Reentry **Strategies would urge** that the Department of Labor invite applicant **community colleges to** collaborate with corrections agencies on one hand and businesses on the other and to integrate **return**ing **prisoners into grantfunded academic and vocational programming.** Ordinarily, gaining the attention of the leadership of a major federal agency such as the Department of Labor for an issue like prisoner reentry might be difficult. Fortunately, the Administration recently created the Federal Interagency Reentry Council and charged it with exactly this task. 26

Prisoners are key. They’re a huge population, and they have 0 skilled work opportunities absent the plan. **Chazelle 11**[[8]](#footnote-8)

The practical benefits of educating prisoners are well documented. **Over ninety percent of inmates eventually return to society; those who receive education**al programming **behind bars are more likely to find jobs** and do without government assistance. They have greater capacity to support relatives financially, contribute in positive ways to their communities, and help their kids succeed in school and stay out of trouble. The benefits extend to the wider public, as well, as study after study shows that educating inmates reduces recidivism – the rate at which they commit new crimes leading to re-arrest or re-incarceration. Although statistics vary, it appears that recidivism among offenders who complete some college work in prison drops by ten percent or more, even if they do not finish a degree. **Postsecondary** correctional **education is**, moreover, a **cost-effective** tool for improving public safety, **since it is** invariably **less expensive than prison** (an average of $25,251 per federal inmate in 2009). By lowering recidivism it saves taxpayers’ money, **and given our massive incarcerated population – over 2.3 million – it helps address the growing education gap between the US and other countries.** That prisons should offer postsecondary education would therefore seem common sense, yet this trait is in short supply among our politicians. The problem lies on both sides of the political spectrum: when it comes to educating inmates or, indeed, to implementing any reform that might mitigate the harshness of our penal system, Democrats, fearful of the soft-on-crime label, are as bad as – if not worse than – Republicans. The Clinton era illustrates this well. Our jail and prison population soared under Clinton, who signed into law the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, a bill sponsored by Democrat Representative Jack Brooks and written by then-Senator Joe Biden. Among the measures of this legislation, sometimes called the “Biden Law,” was a $9.7 billion plan to build new prisons and a sharp increase in the number of crimes subject to the death penalty. Although the bill provided $6.1 billion for prevention initiatives, it contained a bipartisan amendment egregiously counter-prevention: inmates were henceforth barred from Pell grants, the major federal source of college financial assistance for low-income students. The average grant was small, only about $1500 per student in 1994, yet the cumulative impact was huge. With passage of the 1965 Higher Education Act, on which Pell grants were based, the number of postsecondary correctional education programs shot up from twelve that year to 350 during the Reagan presidency. **Ending Pell grants to inmates saved** enough to increase grants to **non-prison students** by **a paltry $5 each** per semester, **while decimating prison postsecondary education programs. After 1994, only eight remained open.**

Aerospace Air and space power are key to deter WMD conflict in Asia.

**Khalilzad and Lesser 98** write[[9]](#footnote-9)

The first key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that **American air and space power will** continue to **remain critical for** conventional and unconventional **deterrence in Asia**. This argument is justified by the fact that several subregions of the continent still harbor the potential for full-scale conventional war. This potential is most conspicuous on the Korean peninsula and, to a lesser degree, in South Asia, the Persian Gulf, and the South China Sea. In some of these areas, such as Korea and the Persian Gulf, the United States has clear treaty obligations and, therefore, has preplanned the use of air power should contingencies arise. U.S. Air Force assets could also be called upon for operations in some of these other areas. In almost all these cases, U.S. air power would be at the forefront of an American politico-military response **because (a)** of the vast **distance**s on the Asian continent; **(b)** the **diverse** range of operational **platforms** available to the U.S. Air Force, a capability unmatched by any other country or service; **(c)** the possible **unavailability of naval assets** in close proximity, particularly in the context of surprise contingencies; **and (d)** the **heavy payload** that can be carried by U.S. Air Force platforms. These platforms can exploit speed, reach, and high operating tempos to sustain continual operations until the political objectives are secured. The entire range of warfighting capability—fighters, bombers, electronic warfare (EW), suppression of enemy air defense (SEAD), combat support platforms such as AWACS and J-STARS, and tankers—are relevant in the Asia-Pacific region, because many of the regional contingencies will involve armed operations against large, fairly modern, conventional forces, most of which are built around large land armies, as is the case in Korea, China-Taiwan, India-Pakistan, and the Persian Gulf. In addition to conventional combat, the demands of unconventional deterrence will increasingly confront the U.S. Air Force in Asia. The **Korea**n peninsula, **China, and** the **India**n subcontinent **are already arenas of** WMD **prolif**eration. While emergent **nuclear** capabilities continue to receive the most public attention, **chemical and bio**logical warfare **threats will** progressively **become future problems.** The delivery systems in the region are increasing in range and diversity. China already targets the continental United States with ballistic missiles. North Korea can threaten northeast Asia with existing Scud-class theater ballistic missiles. India will acquire the capability to produce ICBM-class delivery vehicles, and both China and India will acquire long-range cruise missiles during the time frames examined in this report.

The second key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that **air and space power will function as a vital rapid reaction force** in a breaking crisis. Current guidance tasks the Air Force to prepare for two major regional conflicts that could break out in the Persian Gulf and on the Korean peninsula. In other areas of Asia, however, such as the Indian subcontinent, the South China Sea, Southeast Asia, and Myanmar, the United States has no treaty obligations requiring it to commit the use of its military forces. But as past experience has shown, American policymakers have regularly displayed the disconcerting habit of discovering strategic interests in parts of the world previously neglected after conflicts have already broken out. Mindful of this trend, it would behoove U.S. Air Force planners to prudently plan for regional contingencies in nontraditional areas of interest, because naval and air power will of necessity be the primary instruments constituting the American response. Such responses would be necessitated by three general classes of contingencies. The first involves the politico-military collapse of a key regional actor, as might occur in the case of North Korea, Myanmar, Indonesia, or Pakistan. The second involves acute politicalmilitary crises that have a potential for **rapid escalation**, as **may occur in** the **Taiwan** Strait, **the Spratlys,** the **India**n subcontinent, **or** on the **Korea**n peninsula. The third involves cases of prolonged **domestic instability** that **may** have either **spillover** or contagion effects, as **in China, Indonesia, Myanmar, or North Korea.** In each of these cases, U.S. responses may vary from simply being a concerned onlooker to prosecuting the whole range of military operations to providing post-conflict assistance in a permissive environment. Depending on the political choices made, Air Force contributions would obviously vary. If the first response is selected, contributions would consist predominantly of vital, specialized, airbreathing platforms such as AWACS, JSTARS, and Rivet Joint—in tandem with controlled space assets—that would be necessary for assessment of political crises erupting in the region. The second response, in contrast, would burden the entire range of U.S. Air Force capabilities, in the manner witnessed in Operation Desert Storm. The third response, like the first, would call for specialized capabilities, mostly in the areas of strategic lift and airborne tanker support. The third key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that despite increasing regional air capabilities, U.S. Air Force assets will be required to fill gaps in critical warfighting areas. The capabilities of the Asian states, including those of U.S. allies and neutral states, have been steadily increasing in the last two decades. These increases have occurred largely through the acquisition of late-generation, advanced combat aircraft such as the MiG-29, and the F-15, F-16, and F/A-18 together with short-range infrared and medium-range semi-active air-to-air missiles. Despite such acquisitions, however, the states that possess these aircraft have not become truly effective users of air power, in part because acquiring advanced combat aircraft and their associated technologies is a small part of ensuring overall proficiency in the exploitation of air power. The latter includes incorporating effective training regimes, maintaining large and diverse logistics networks, developing an indigenous industrial infrastructure capable of supporting the variegated air assets, and integrating specific subspecialties such as air-to-air refueling, electronic warfare, suppression of enemy air defenses, airspace surveillance and battle management capabilities in a hostile environment, and night and adverse weather operations. Most of the Asian air forces lack full air-power capabilities of the sort described above. The Japanese and South Korean air forces are, as a rule, optimized mostly for air defense operations. Both air forces are generally proficient in all-weather defensive counterair operations, and they possess relatively modest day ground-attack capabilities as well. Because of their specific operating environments, however, the Japanese air force is particularly proficient in maritime air operations, whereas the South Korean air force has some close air support (CAS) experience as well. The Chinese air force (People’s Liberation Army Air Force, [PLAAF]) is still a predominantly daylight defensive counterair force with limited daylight attack capabilities, as are most of the Southeast Asian air forces, but the PLAAF has recently demonstrated an impressive ability to integrate its new weapon systems (e.g., the Su-27) much faster than most observers expected. The air forces of the Indian subcontinent have somewhat greater capabilities. Most squadrons of the Indian and Pakistani air forces are capable of daylight defensive counterair, a few are capable of all-weather defensive counterair, and several Indian units are capable of battlefield air interdiction and deep penetration-interdiction strike. None of these air forces, however, is particularly proficient at night and all-weather ground attack, especially at operational ranges. They lack advanced munitions, especially in the air-to-surface regime. With the exception of Japan and Singapore, they lack battle management command, control and communications (BMC3 ) platforms as well as the logistics and training levels required for successful, extended, high-tempo operations. **The brittle quality of Asian air forces implies that U.S. Air Force** assets **will be required** to fill critical gaps in allied air capabilities as well as to counter both the growing capabilities of potential adversaries such as China and the new nontraditional threats emerging in the form of ballistic and cruise missiles, information warfare, WMD, and possibly even the revolution in military affairs. The fourth key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that there will be increasing political constraints on en-route and in-theater access. Problems of basing for en-route and in-theater access will become of concern as the Asian states grow in confidence and capability. For the moment, however, such problems have been held in check because of the continuing threats on the Korean peninsula and recent revitalization of the U.S.-Japanese security treaty. But these developments constitute only a reprieve, not an enduring solution. The availability of the Korean bases after unification is an open question. Even if these and the Japanese bases continue to be available, their use will be increasingly restricted by the host countries for routine training operations and especially for nontraditional out-of-area operations. The recent difficulties caused by the refusal of the Gulf states to permit U.S. air operations against Saddam Hussein will become the norm in the Asia-Pacific region as well. There are already some indicators to this effect. For example, constitutional and legal restraints in the form of Article 9 could prevent Japan from providing access, logistical support, and reinforcements in the context of crises in Asia. There is also relatively weak political support for all but the most narrow range of contingencies, as became evident in Japanese, Korean, and Southeast Asian reluctance to support U.S. gunboat diplomacy during the recent (1995–1996) China-Taiwan face-off. Even the Southeast states, which benefit most from U.S. presence and deterrent capabilities in the region, were conspicuously silent—and in some cases even undercut American efforts at restraining Chinese intimidation of Taiwan. Besides these growing political constraints, the fact remains that in some feasible contingencies the U.S. Air Force will have little or no access whatsoever to some regions in Asia. The absence of air bases in Southeast Asia and the northern Indian Ocean, for example, could threaten the execution of contingency plans involving either South Asia or Myanmar. The vast distances in the Asia-Pacific region could come to haunt Air Force operations, because existing facilities at Diego Garcia and in the Persian Gulf are too far away for any but the most minimal operations. Increasing political constrictions coupled with the sparse number of operating facilities available imply that even such potentially innovative U.S. Air Force solutions as the “air expeditionary force” and “composite air wings” could run into show-stopping impediments beyond U.S. Air Force control. This, in turn, has four consequences. First, American policymakers should investigate the possibility of securing additional air base access in Asia. The most attractive candidate, especially in the context of a rising China, is Cam Ran Bay in Vietnam. Other alternatives, especially for contingencies in the Persian Gulf and the greater South Asian region, could include transit rights in India or Pakistan. Second, U.S. Air Force planners will have to devote relatively greater resources to mobility assets and support platforms such as airborne tankers to keep a smaller combat force capable of long-distance operations. Third, planners must begin to give some thought to novel technologies capable of mitigating the access and staging problem. These technologies can include, at the more radical end, floating air bases of the kind proposed by RAND several decades ago, or at the more conservative technical end, more-efficient engines, longer-range aircraft, and the like. Fourth, U.S. Air Force planners must increasingly think in terms of joint operations not merely at the cosmetic level, as in the cruise missile strikes against Iraq, but in terms of a true division of labor, especially in the early stages of a distant contingency. The fifth key implication derived from the analysis of **trends in Asia suggest**s **that WMD**-shadowed environments **will pose new** operational **challenges to air power.** There is little doubt that the **number of** states possessing different kinds of **WMD will increase** during the time frames examined in this report. While Russia, China, North Korea, India, and Pakistan are the only nuclear-capable states in Asia at the moment, several other states likely are virtual nuclear powers (Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan), with Iran and Iraq in the wings. All these states are threatened by nuclear capabilities in some form, and many will be able to mount nuclear threats of their own at some point. Although nuclear capabilities concentrate the mind in a way that few other weapons do, **chemical and bio**logical **weapon**s will also come in to their own, and their **use for** either operations or **terror may be even more probable.** All three forms of WMD, as well as radiological weapons, could be delivered by either ballistic or cruise missiles, advanced combat aircraft, or unconventional means of delivery. These regional operating environments will thus become more complicated over time. In this context, **the** U.S. **Air Force will require** both **new capabilities** and new concepts of operations for successful combat in such environments. **These** new capabilities **include** better means of **localizing WMD** holdings **at long range;** better means of **interdicting storage facilities**, especially those relying on depth or dispersal for survival; **and** better means of effectively **intercepting WMD carriers** if their prelaunch destruction is not possible. New concepts of operations involve devising and using better ways to continue combat operations amidst a WMD environment, new forms of warfare including information warfare to subvert an adversary’s combat capability rather than physically destroying it, and, finally, new “nonlethal” weapons to attain results previously attainable by lethal means alone.

Advantage 3 is R&D

Funding for university research is declining now due to budget shortfalls.

**Matthews 12**[[10]](#footnote-10)

Historically, **the federal government has been the primary source of funding for basic research at** colleges and **universities.** In FY2008, **the fed**eral government **provided** approximately **60% of** an estimated $51.9 billion of **R&D funds** expended by academic institutions. 31 In current dollars, federal support for academic research increased by 2.5% between FY2007 and FY2008. When inflation is taken into account, federal funding increased 0.2% from FY2007 to FY2008 following two years of decline in constant dollars since FY2005. 32 Data from the NSF reveal that federal funding of research and development has focused more on basic than applied research, while private sector funding support has focused on development. 33 NSF found that in FY2008, **institutions of higher education perform**ed approximately **56% of the nation’s basic research.** 3 **Many** colleges and universities, especially **state schools**, **are experiencing declining revenues, due to reductions in state support**, endowments, and in some instances, tuition. 35 According to one source, it is estimated that approximately **35 states have experienced** a **decline in revenue for** FY**2012, with many states operating in a deficit.** 36 As a result, state funding for universities has fallen in many states. Some colleges are considering deferring maintenance projects and proposing increases in tuition. While states are cutting funding to address revenue declines and decreases in their operating budgets, these same institutions are simultaneously viewed as partners in further developing the economy of their respective states.

Post-secondary prison education frees up billions in funding for US universities.

**Mayeux 10**[[11]](#footnote-11)

The irony, of course, or maybe this was just the point all along, is that Hutchison was right: **Hundreds of thousands** of would-be college students **have been denied** access to **higher education because of money spent on prisoners, but not because [of]** prisoners have been sucking up all the college **grants. In many states prisons** now **receive** far **more gov**ernment **funding than colleges and universities** do — even though all that government funding mostly goes **to keep**ing **prisoners idle.** As California struggles to keep not just its once-legendary state university system but also the state itself afloat, it’s worth noting, **a**s **UCLA professor** Chan Noriega recently **calculated, that “California could send every last prisoner to a UC campus, covering all expenses, and** still **save** nearly **$2.3 billion per year.”**

Empirics prove. Prisoner Pell Grants are the most cost-effective criminal justice policy. **Karpowitz and Kenner 2k**[[12]](#footnote-12)

In the 1990s, elected officials began introducing legislation to prohibit tuition assistance to inmates. The United States Department of Education resisted this change of policy, and continued to support the use of Pell grants in America’s prisons. As part of this effort, the Department’s Office of Correctional Education issued a Facts and Commentary in 1995 entitled “Pell Grants for Prisoners,” in which it stated that “Pell grants help inmates obtain the skills and education needed to acquire and keep a job following their eventual release.”18 Furthermore, the Department published the following facts in support of Pell eligibility for the incarcerated:19 • Of the $5.3 billion awarded in Pell grants in 1993, about $34 million were awarded to inmates. This represents less than 1/10 of one percent (1%) of the total grant awards. • The annual Pell grant awarded per inmate was less than $1,300. • Pell grants are given to education providers, not to inmates, to pay for the inmates’ educational expenses. • Death row inmates and inmates serving life sentences without parole were not eligible for Pell grants. Despite the position of policy experts within the federal and state government, including both educators and correctional officials, the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act effectively dismantled correctional higher education. Almost overnight, the most effective and cost-beneficial correctional policy in the United States collapsed. Some states, like Texas, have found ways to continue post-secondary education in corrections despite this change in federal policy.20 Many others, like New York, experienced the near total collapse of this outstanding form of crime prevention. In New York State, there were nearly 70 post-secondary prison programs in April of 1994. Four months later, there were four programs left. Today, two of those programs are on the verge of closing. 5 Cost Efficiencies: A Cost-Benefit Analysis Case Study Many of the federal and state government studies of recidivism and correctional education have included a particular focus on the cost-savings of such programs compared to other forms of crime prevention. For example, **The** U.S. **D**epartment **o**f **E**ducation’s “Three State Recidivism **Study**” of 1997 **drew** particular **attention to the tremendous cost-savings** per dollar spent on such programs. As noted above, according to the Correctional Education Association’s study sponsored by the Department, **every dollar spent on education returned more than two dollars** to the citizens **in** reduced **prison costs.**21 A **far more detailed** cost-benefit analysis has been carried out in the State of Florida. Using the Costs Consequences Analysis model developed by TaxWatch (FTW), and the Florida State University Center for Needs Assessment & Planning (CNAP), adapted by the Florida Department of Corrections (FDC), FTW and CNAP examined FDC educational programs to study returns on public investment in job training and education programs conducted by the FDC.22 Among the **study results** was the **find**ing **that all sub-groups** of Correctional Education completers for FY 1993-4 **had positive return on investment** ratios. The combined Costs-Consequences Analysis ratio reported at $1.66 return for every $1.00 invested. The highest return was for academic completers, with $3.53 returned for $1.00 of public investment.23 Conclusion This report illustrates **the overwhelming consensus** among public officials **[is] that postsecondary education is the most** successful and **cost-effective** method of preventing crime. **As proven by** the **government studies** cited in this memo, **the** public-safety and **economic impact** of correctional education **is enormous**. In the past these profoundly positive effects were widespread **even though** such **grants accounted for** roughly one-**half of 1% of total Pell investment**s.24 The cost-effectiveness of this policy is manifest, and has been detailed in officially recognized cost-benefit analyses. The United States Government should resume its policy of releasing a fraction of **Pell Grants** to qualified incarcerated Americans. An extremely modest public investment **would create a massive response from private**, non-profit educational and religious **organizations**. Such a policy would **sharply cut** rates of **recidivism and save** the states **millions** of dollars.

Federal funding for university R&D is key to solve warming, disease, and economic growth. **Dooley and Paxson 12-31** write[[13]](#footnote-13)

As leaders in Washington and Rhode Island consider the current economic circumstances -- the Fiscal Cliff -- numerous budget "deals" and possible sequestration, we urge all to consider the importance of and need for strategic investment in one of our nation's most valuable resources: higher education. Without question, the looming deficit, expiring tax cuts and threat of across-the- board spending reductions requires difficult decisions to address America's long-term needs. But, when possible cuts to federal education and research funding threaten the future of American progress and creativity, then we will have truly jumped off a cliff. **In Rhode Island,** the state's leading **research universities**, the University of Rhode Island and Brown, **are** being seen by the private, public and nonprofit sectors as providing the **essential** fuel **to** propel **the** state's **economy.** Through education and research, our universities attract vital resources to support the advancement of knowledge, ideas and innovation. In turn, and in fulfillment of our missions, we prepare a significant segment of the state's workforce and provide the infrastructure upon which companies, and jobs, are built. Continuing to do **this** successfully **demands** a **stable** source of **federal research funding.** This is particularly critical as state support for higher education has diminished, incentives for charitable giving are threatened and we seek to moderate tuition increases while ensuring access for qualified students. In 2011 URI and Brown brought to the state about $250 million in **federal** research **dollars**. In addition to **provid[e]**ing **the funds needed to advance research** and understanding **of** areas ranging from autism to Alzheimer's **disease,** to forms of cancer, global **warming,** transportation **and alternative energy**, these funds have also employed thousands of people. Combined, more than 6,700 faculty and staff work at our institutions, and we enroll more than 25,100 graduate and undergraduate students. The majority of our employees live in Rhode Island, have homes here, pay state and local taxes and contribute otherwise to the fabric of our communities. Basic research is essential for long-term growth and is a cornerstone of the state's economy. According to the Rhode Island Science and Technology Advisory Council, more than 20,000 individuals are employed in research and development-related positions in Rhode Island and 118 companies are directly engaged in R&D pursuits. The National Science Foundation estimates that R&D represents 2.6 percent of Rhode Island's gross domestic product. The state's colleges and universities provide much of the innovation and human capital to support this R&D infrastructure. We attract and support the talented faculty, students and staff to our campuses and provide them with the facilities, tools and equipment to advance research and discovery, which in turn leads to commercialization, companies and employment. As decision makers identify opportunities for spending cuts, we urge that they keep in mind that funding for research and education, which makes up a tiny portion of the relatively small total federal discretionary budget, has already borne the brunt of recent federal cutbacks. In fact, since 2010, federal programs that support most scientific research have been cut by 10 percent on average, and face further cuts of more than 8 percent should our nation's leaders fail to prevent a fall from the fiscal cliff. Nationwide, this would mean about $12 billion in reductions across the board to R&D affecting the National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, the Department of Education and nearly every other agency. Locally, our institutions alone could see a loss of up to $25 million in just a single year. Such reductions would affect jobs, spending and ultimately revenue collected by the state. Perhaps more devastating would be the long-term implications of such cuts. We know that as much as **half of** U.S. **economic growth since World War II is a** direct or indirect **result of tech**nological **innovation**, much of which was **made possible through federally funded** scientific **research.** We must spare from continued cuts areas that are critical to our nation's ability to generate the ideas, discoveries and enterprises of the future. Rhode Island has been hit especially hard by the nation's severe recession and has been slow to recover. The state and local governments are struggling to provide services, and unemployment still exceeds 10 percent. It is not surprising that, at times like this, some may question the value of investing in basic research. Although the fruits of scholarship are not always predictable, **one thing is clear: If America's universities don't undertake this work** that not only solves problems but creates new, sustainable jobs, **no one will.** And the community, the nation and the world would be poorer as a result.

Ocean studies prove warming causes extinction. **Sify 10** writes[[14]](#footnote-14)

Sydney: Scientists have sounded alarm bells about how growing concentrations of **greenhouse gases are driving irreversible** and dramatic **change**s **in** the way the **oceans** function, providing evidence that humankind could well be on the way to the next great extinction. **The findings** of the comprehensive report: 'The impact of climate change on the world's marine ecosystems' **emerged from a synthesis of recent research** on the world's oceans, carried out **by two of the world's leading marine scientists**. One of the authors of the report is Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, professor at The University of Queensland and the director of its Global Change Institute (GCI). 'We may see sudden, unexpected changes that have serious ramifications for the overall well-being of humans, including the capacity of the planet to support people. This is **further evidence that we are well on the way to** the next great **extinction** event,' says Hoegh-Guldberg. 'The findings have enormous implications for mankind, particularly **if the trend continues.** The earth's ocean, which produces half of the oxygen we breathe and absorbs 30 per cent of human-generated carbon dioxide, is equivalent to its heart and lungs. This study shows worrying signs of ill-health. It's as if the earth has been smoking two packs of cigarettes a day!,' he added. 'We are entering a period in which the ocean services upon which humanity depends are undergoing massive change and in some cases beginning to fail', he added.

Pandemic disease is likely and causes extinction. **Keating 09**[[15]](#footnote-15)

How it could happen: **Throughout history, plagues have brought civilizations to their knees. The Black Death killed** more off more than **half of Europe**'s population in the Middle Ages. **In 1918,** a **flu** pandemic **killed** an estimated 50 million people, nearly **3 percent of the world**'s **population**, a far **greater** impact **than** the just-concluded **World War I. Because of globalization, diseases today spread even faster** - witness the rapid worldwide spread of H1N1 currently unfolding. A **global outbreak of** a **disease** **such as ebola** virus -- **which has** had a **90 percent fatality** rate during its flare-ups in rural Africa -- **or a** mutated **drug-resistant** form of the **flu** virus on a global scale **could have a** devastating, even **civilization-ending impact.** How likely is it? Treatment of deadly diseases has improved since 1918, but so have the diseases. Modern industrial farming techniques have been blamed for the outbreak of diseases, such as swine flu, and **as** the world’s population grows and **humans move into** previously **unoccupied areas, the risk of** exposure to previously **unknown pathogens increases. More than 40 new viruses** have **emerged since the** 19**70s**, including ebola and HIV. **Bio**logical **weapons** experimentation has **add**ed **a new** and just as troubling **complication.**

Existential risk outweighs every other impact by orders of magnitude because of the lost potential for future generations. **Bostrom 11**[[16]](#footnote-16)

Even if we use **the most conservative** of these **estimates,** which entirely ignores the possibility of space colonization and software minds, we **find that the expected loss of an existential catastrophe is greater than** the value of **1018 human lives.  This implies that** the expected value of **reducing existential risk by a mere one millionth of one percentage point is at least ten times the value of a billion human lives.**  The more technologically comprehensive estimate of 1054 human-brain-emulation subjective life-years (or 1052 lives of ordinary length) makes the same point even more starkly.  Even if we give this allegedly lower bound on the cumulative output potential of a technologically mature civilization a mere 1% chance of being correct, we find that the expected value of reducing existential risk by a mere one billionth of one billionth of one percentage point is worth a hundred billion times as much as a billion human lives.

Moral uncertainty is high now, but there’s room for improvement. **Parfit 84** writes[[17]](#footnote-17)

Some people believe that there cannot be progress in Ethics, since everything has been already said. Like Rawls and Nagel, I believe the opposite. How many people have made Non-Religious Ethics their life's work? Before the recent past, very few. In most civilizations, **most people have believed in** the existence of a **God**, or of several gods. A large minority were in fact Atheists, whatever they pretended. But, **before the recent past, very few Atheists made Ethics their life’s work.** Buddha may be among this few, as may Confucius, and a few Ancient Greeks and Romans. After more than a thousand years, there were a few more between the Sixteenth and Twentieth centuries. Hume was an atheist who made Ethics part of his life's work. Sidgwick was another. **After Sidgwick,** there were several **atheists** who were professional moral philosophers. But most of these **did not do Ethics. They did Meta-Ethics.** They did not ask which outcomes would be good or bad, or which acts would be right or wrong. They asked, and wrote about, only the meaning of moral language, and the question of objectivity. **Non-Religious Ethics has been systematically studied**, by many people, **only since the** 19**60s. Compared with the other sciences**, Non-Religious **Ethics is** the youngest and **the least advanced.**

Adopt a parliamentary model to account for moral uncertainty. This entails minimizing existential risks. **Bostrom 9** writes[[18]](#footnote-18)

It seems people are overconfident about their moral beliefs.  But **how should one** reason and **act if one** acknowledges that one **is uncertain about morality** – not just applied ethics but fundamental moral issues? if you don't know which moral theory is correct?

It doesn't seem **you can[’t] simply plug your uncertainty into expected utility** decision theory and crank the wheel; **because many** moral **theories** state that you **should not** always **maximize** expected **utility.**

Even if we limit consideration to consequentialist theories, it still is hard to see how to combine them in the standard decision theoretic framework.  For example, suppose you give X% probability to total utilitarianism and (100-X)% to average utilitarianism.  Now an action might add 5 utils to total happiness and decrease average happiness by 2 utils.  (This could happen, e.g. if you create a new happy person that is less happy than the people who already existed.)  Now what do you do, for different values of X?

The problem gets even more complicated if we consider not only consequentialist theories but also deontological theories, contractarian theories, virtue ethics, etc.  We might even throw various meta-ethical theories into the stew: error theory, relativism, etc.

I'm working on a paper on this together with my colleague Toby Ord.  We have some arguments against a few possible "solutions" that we think don't work.  On the positive side we have some tricks that work for a few special cases.  But beyond that, the best **we have managed** so far is **a** kind of **metaphor, which** we don't think is literally and exactly correct, and it is a bit under-determined, but it **seems to get things roughly right** and it might point in the right direction:

**The Parliamentary Model.**  Suppose that you have a set of mutually exclusive moral theories, and that you assign each of these some probability.  Now imagine that **each** of these **theorie**s **gets to send** some number of **delegates to The Parliament**.  The number of delegates each theory gets to send is **proportional to the probability of the theory.**  Then the delegates bargain with one another for support on various issues; and the Parliament reaches a decision by the delegates voting.  What you should do is act according to the decisions of this imaginary Parliament.  (Actually, we use an extra trick here: we imagine that the delegates act as if the Parliament's decision were a stochastic variable such that the probability of the Parliament taking action A is proportional to the fraction of votes for A.  This has the effect of eliminating the artificial 50% threshold that otherwise gives a majority bloc absolute power.  Yet – unbeknownst to the delegates – the Parliament always takes whatever action got the most votes: this way we avoid paying the cost of the randomization!)

The idea here is that moral theories get more influence the more probable they are; yet **even a** relatively **weak theory can still get its way on some issues** that the theory think are extremely important **by sacrificing** its influence **on other** i**s**sues that other theories deem more important.  For example, **suppose you assign 10% probability to** total **util**itarianism and 90% to moral egoism (just to illustrate the principle).  Then **the Parliament** would mostly take actions that maximize egoistic satisfaction; however it **would make some concessions to util**itarianism **on** issues that utilitarianism thinks is especially important.  In this example, the person might donate some portion of their income to **existential risks** research and otherwise live completely selfishly.

I think there might be wisdom in **this model**.  It **avoids the** dangerous and **unstable extremism** that would result **from letting one’s current favorite moral theory completely dictate action**, while still allowing the aggressive pursuit of some non-commonsensical high-leverage strategies so long as they don’t infringe too much on what other major moral theories deem centrally important.

I don’t need to win that weighing values is possible. Extinction precludes all values, so it is wrong under any moral code. **Seeley 86**[[19]](#footnote-19)

In moral reasoning prediction of consequences is nearly always impossible. One balances the risks of an action against its benefits; one also considers what known damage the action would do. Thus a surgeon in deciding whether to perform an operation weighs the known effects (the loss of some nerve function, for example) and risks (death) against the benefits, and weighs also the risks and benefits of not performing surgery. Morally, however, **human extinction is unlike any other risk. No conceivable human good could be worth** the **extinction** of the race, **for** in order **to be a human good it must be experienced by human beings.** Thus extinction is one result we dare not-may not-risk. Though not conclusively established, **the risk of extinction is real enough to make nuclear war** utterly **impermissible under any** sane **moral code.**

Infinite values don’t paralyze calculation. **Lauwers and Vallentyne 04** write[[20]](#footnote-20)

**Zero Independence holds that the ranking of two worlds is determined by** the pattern of **differences in local value. This**, we claim, **is highly plausible** in the context of finitely additive value theories. In the finite case, finitely additive value theories always satisfy Zero Independence. Although they typically get expressed as judging a world as at least as good as another (having the same locations) if and only if its total value is at least as great, the **reference to the total is not needed.** An equivalent statement is that one world as at least as good as the second if and only if the sum of the differences in value is at least as great as zero. **Only the pattern of differences matters**. **Even in the infinite case**, Zero Independence is “partially” implied by Sum and Loose Pareto. Sum ranks U as at least as good as V if and only if Sum ranks U-V as at least as good as its zero world. Moreover, if two worlds U and V satisfy the antecedent clause of Loose Pareto, then Loose Pareto ranks U as at least as good as V if and only if it ranks U-V above its zero world. Zero Independence is thus, we claim, highly plausible for finitely additive theories.

Zero Independence is equivalent to a condition in social choice theory known as Translation Scale Invariance when it is restricted to the case where locations are the same.[[21]](#footnote-21) This latter condition holds that interlocational comparisons of zero points are irrelevant to the ranking of worlds. The zero point for value at each location, that is, can be set independently of how it is set for other locations (although, of course, when comparing two worlds, the zero point used for a given location in one world must also be used for that location in the second world). For example, if a location has values of 10 in world U and 5 in world V, both measured on the basis of some particular zero point (the same for both worlds), those values could be changed to 7 and 2 (by making the zero point 3 units higher for that location), and this, according to Translation Scale Invariance, would not alter how the two worlds are ranked.

Zero Independence is equivalent to Translation Scale Invariance (restricted to the case where locations are the same), since any change in the zero points for the locations in worlds U and V can, for some W, be represented by U+W and V+W. (For example, if there are just two people, and the first person’s zero point is decreased by two units, and the second person’s zero point is increased by one unit, then the resulting two representations of the value of U and V are simply U+W and V+W, where W is <2,-1>.) Zero Independence and Translation Scale Invariance thus each hold that U ≥ V if and only if U+W ≥ V+W.

Translation Scale Invariance (and hence, Zero Independence) is highly plausible for finitely additive value theories. (Recall that our goal is to defend a particular extension of finite additivity, not to defend finite additivity against non-additive theories.) **If there is no natural zero point that separates positive from negative value** (if there is just more or less value with no natural separating point), **then any particular zero point is arbitrary** (not representing a real aspect of value). In this case, interlocational comparisons of zero-points are uncontroversially irrelevant. **If**, on the other hand, **there is a natural zero for value, it is still** plausible for finitely additive value theories to hold that it is **irrelevant** for ranking worlds. **What matters** (e.g., **from** a **util**itarian perspective), as argued above, **are** the **differences in value at each location between two worlds—not the absolute level of values** at locations. No interlocational comparison of zero points is needed for this purpose.

Cost-benefit analysis is feasible. Ignore any util calc indicts. **Hardin 90** writes[[22]](#footnote-22)

**One** of the **cute**r **charge**s **against util**itarianism **is that** it is irrational in the following sense. **If I take the time to calculate** the consequences of various courses of action before me, **then** I will ipso facto have chosen the course of action to take, namely, to sit and calculate, because while I am calculating the other **courses of action will cease to be open to me. It should embarrass philosophers that they have ever taken this** objection **seriously. Parallel considerations in other realms are dismissed** with eminently good sense. Lord Devlin notes, “If the reasonable man ‘worked to rule’ by perusing to the point of comprehension every form he was handed, the commercial and administrative life of the country would creep **to** a standstill.” James March and Herbert Simon **escape** the quandary of **unending calculation** by noting that often we satisfice, **we do not maximize: we stop calculating** and considering **when we find a merely adequate choice** of action. **When**, in principle, **one cannot know what is** the **best** choice, **one can nevertheless be sure that** sitting and **calculating is not the best choice.** But, one may ask, How do you know that another ten minutes of calculation would not have produced a better choice? And one can only answer, You do not. At some point the quarrel begins to sound adolescent. It is ironic that **the point** of the quarrel **is almost never at issue in practice** (as Devlin implies, **we are** almost all **too reasonable** in practice **to bring the world to a standstill**) but only in the principled discussions of academics.

Ignore permissibility and presumption because moral uncertainty means we’ll always have a non-zero credence in the existence of morality, so there’s always a risk of offense in favor of one action.

Neg burden is to defend a competitive post-fiat United States policy. Offense-defense is key to fairness and real world education. This means ignore skepticism. **Nelson 08** writes[[23]](#footnote-23)

And **the truth-statement model** of the resolution **imposes an absolute burden of proof on the aff**irmative: if the resolution is a truth-claim, and the afﬁrmative has the burden of proving that claim, in so far as intuitively we tend to disbelieve truthclaims until we are persuaded otherwise, the afﬁrmative has the burden to prove that statement absolutely true. Indeed, one of the most common theory arguments in LD is conditionality, which argues it is inappropriate for the afﬁrmative to claim only proving the truth of part of the resolution is sufﬁcient to earn the ballot. Such a model of the resolution also gives the negative access to a range of strategies that many students, coaches, and judges ﬁnd ridiculous or even irrelevant to evaluation of the resolution.

If the **neg**ative **need only** prevent the affirmative from proving the truth of the resolution, it is logically sufficient to negate to **deny our ability to make truth-statements or** to **prove** normative **morality does not exist** or to deny the reliability of human senses or reason. Yet, even though most coaches appear to endorse the truth-statement model of the resolution, they complain about the use of such negative strategies, even though they are a necessary consequence of that model. And, moreover, **such strategies** seem fundamentally unfair, as they **provide the neg**ative **with functionally inﬁnite ground**, as there are a nearly inﬁnite variety of such skeptical objections to normative claims, while continuing to bind the afﬁrmative to a much smaller range of options: advocacy of the resolution as a whole.

Instead, it seems much more reasonable to treat the resolution as a way to equitably divide ground: the affirmative advocating the desirability of a world in which people adhere to the value judgment implied by the resolution and the negative advocating the desirability of a world in which people adhere to a value judgment mutually exclusive to that implied by the resolution. By making the issue one of desirability of **[Under] competing world-views** rather than of truth, the affirmative gains access to increased flexibility regarding how he or she chooses to defend that world, while the **neg**ative **retains equal flexibility while being denied** access to those **skeptical arguments** indicted above. Our ability to make normative claims is irrelevant to a discussion of the desirability of making two such claims. Unless there is some significant harm in making such statements, some offensive reason to reject making them that can be avoided by an advocacy mutually exclusive with that of the affirmative such objections are not a reason the negative world is more desirable, and therefore not a reason to negate. Note this is precisely how things have been done in policy debate for some time: a team that runs a kritik is expected to offer some impact of the mindset they are indicting and some alternative that would solve for that impact. A team that simply argued some universal, unavoidable, problem was bad and therefore a reason to negate would not be very successful. It is about time LD started treating such arguments the same way.

**Such a model** of the resolution has additional benefits as well. First, it **forces both debaters to offer offensive reasons to prefer** their worldview, thereby further **enforcing a parallel burden structure.** This means debaters can no longer get away with arguing the resolution is by definition true of false. The “truth” of the particular vocabulary of the resolution is irrelevant to its desirability. **Second, it is intuitive. When people evaluate** the truth of **ethical claims, they consider their implications in the real world.** They ask themselves whether a world in which people live by that ethical rule is better than one in which they don’t. Such debates don’t happen solely in the abstract. We want to know how the various options affect us and the world we live in.

The neg must defend one unconditional advocacy. Conditionality is bad because it makes the neg a moving target which kills 1AR strategy. He’ll kick it if I cover it and extend it if I undercover it, meaning I have no strategic options. Also, it’s unreciprocal because I can’t kick the AC.

Pell Grants solve prison violence. **Page 4** writes[[24]](#footnote-24)

PSCE [postsecondary correctional **education**] **programs help prison workers maintain carceral order.** In **a** 1974 **study** of a PSCE program in a maximum-security prison, Alfred Blumstein found that the program ‘improves institutional climate’ and made the prisoner-students ‘more manageable residents’ (quoted in Duguid, 1987: 23). PSCE programs, like all ‘meaningful program opportunities available to prisoners’, are good ‘institutional management tools’ (DiIulio, 1991: 114), for **they keep prisoners busy; they are ‘carrots’ that can be taken away if prisoners act up; and they help prisoners develop pro-social,** non-violent and **non-criminal identities, making them less likely to resort to physical confrontation** to solve problems (Taylor, 1993).

Prison violence leads to AIDS spread in prisons. **Shah 05**[[25]](#footnote-25)

Prisons are hostile environments. Assaults among prisoners, **violence between prisoners** and prison officers, suicide, self-mutilation, and open syringes and needles containing blood as a result of drug usage are all occurrences in prison environments. Such actions **expedite** the **transmission of** communicable **disease**s**.** In an effort to thwart disease spread, prison guards and employees are encouraged to take precautions to prevent contracting or spreading diseases. Usage of impermeable gloves and a uniform worn only in the prison are the minimum precautionary measures to reduce exposure to diseases, as recommended by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) [1] for prison guards and employees. Ideally, all prison guards, employees, and inmates should be provided with gloves. **Protective** eyewear, aprons, tongs or forceps, and disinfectant solution are all additional measures that should seriously limit disease-causing contact with prisoners and thereby reduce disease spread [2]. Unfortunately, such preventive **measures are costly** and considered impractical at the current time, leaving prisons mostly only able to screen inmates for health problems. Meanwhile, involuntary actions such as the **increasing** numbers of **rapes** in prisons are **fuel**ing **disease spread** as well. According to Laura Stemple, executive director of the human rights group Stop Prison Rape, the rate of sexual abuse is as high as 27% among women in some prisons. In the general United States population, only three in every ten thousand people have been raped according to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) [3]. However, in prisons, one in five has been sexually assaulted, while one in ten has been raped while in prison [4]. Thus, disease spread through rape is far more likely in prisons. Many victims of rape find it embarrassing to reveal that they have been raped and refuse HIV/AIDS testing and other tests for sexually transmitted diseases. Oftentimes, prisons ignore rapes because it clearly displays to the public and government that the prison administration has not been effective. Rape is not death and therefore is easy to conceal. Thus, many prisons have gotten away with concealing rape incidences and are not pressured to prevent it from occurring. In response, Congress introduced the Prison Rape Reduction Act in 2002 to establish a national commission to drastically reduce rape occurrences in prisons nationwide. The Act established committees by the Justice Department that review prisons annually. Those prisons with unusually high rape incidents would have to undergo examination and determine how to improve. An acute disease such as HIV/AIDS is already a health obstacle in American society. According to the NIAID, **the rate of** HIV/**AIDS** infections **has been** continuously **increasing** despite increased efforts taken by the government and activist groups to control the HIV/AIDS spread. Shockingly, the rate of HIV/**AIDS spread is five to ten times higher in prisons** than that in the general population according one study by the U.S Department of Justice [5]. **When** prison **inmates are released** back into society**,** the **chances of** incidence of HIV/**AIDS are dramatically increased. An already deadly** and difficult-to-control **disease is becoming more difficult to control.** Health concerns are not monitored closely enough in prisons. The Prison Rape Reduction Act is a step in the right direction; however, more funding should be allocated to ensure prisons are safer. After all, those same individuals who are disregarded as **prisoners will return to society** as regular citizens **and** will **spread** communicable **disease**s.

AIDS causes extinction.

**Lederberg 91**[[26]](#footnote-26)

Will Aids mutate further ? Already known, **a** vexing **feature of AIDS is its** antigenic **variability,** further **complicating** the task of developing **a vaccine.** So we know that **HIV is still evolving.** Its global spread has meant there is far more HIV on earth today than ever before in history. **What are the odds of** its learning the tricks of **airborne transmission?** The short is, “**No one can be sure.**” But we could make the same attribution about any virus; alternatively the next influenza or chicken pox may mutate to an unprecedented lethality. As time passes, and HIV seems settled in a certain groove, that is momentary reassurance in itself. **However,** given its other ugly attributes, **it is hard to imagine a worse threat to humanity than** an **airborne** variant of **AIDS. No rule of nature contradicts such a possibility;** the **prolif**eration **of AIDS** cases with secondary pneumonia **multiplies the odds of such a mutant, as an analogue to** the emergence of **pneumonic plague.**

Err aff on theory. This topic is moving toward massive neg side bias. Neg won 30% more rounds at NDCA and all but one elim.

## 1AR

### Farnham NC

1. No link to Pell Grants. The Plan doesn’t affect sentencing.

2. TURN – The Plan solves free riding. Giving inmates education ensures they contribute to the economy and stop committing crimes – That’s Buzzini 9.

3. Devolves to util. It would be in society’s interest to agree to maximize utility all the time. Controls the link to Farnham since he says society is created for mutual benefit.

4. The warrants for the side constraint are pragmatic, not absolute, so extinction still comes first.

5. Turn – criminals are disproportionately poor, so it’s good to help them because it brings them closer to the social equilibrium.

6. Extinction is a prereq. Can’t have society in the first place if we’re all dead.

### Delay CP

1. Perm do the counter-plan. It’s aff ground. (A) Normal means is months of debate in congress, not immediate passage. Immigration reform proves. (B) Plan would be bottom of the docket. Congress would resolve immigration, gun control and debt ceiling first.

These also take out the link to politics because Pell Grants wouldn’t trigger the link in time.

2. Delay counterplans are a voting issue. A. they kill clash. He just goes for politics and never has to engage the aff. Clash comes first. It’s the only form of education unique to debate. B. Kills fairness because he moots the whole 1AC with fiat. It’s a voter. My 1AR was already skewed. He spent 10 seconds on this in the NC. Also it’s a voter for deterrence.

3. Counter-plans must have solvency advocates. He violates. No one says “Delay Pell Grants until the debt ceiling.” (A) Key to predictability. If it’s not in the lit, I have no way to expect it. (B) key to ground. If no one writes about it, I can’t find answers. (C) Key to education. If it were real world, someone would write about it. We’re debating made up scenarios.

4. No solvency. Debt ceiling won’t happen. That’s on the DA. Proves the CP is just the squo.

5. All advocacies must be stable. He violates. His counter-plan shifts based on when or if debt ceiling is passed. Kills my ground. I can’t generate a solvency deficit if it’s not even clear when the counter-plan happens.

Justifies perm do the counter-plan independent of theory because the counter-plan might lead to pell grants passing right now.

6. Terminal solvency deficit. Pell grants won’t get passed in the middle of debate about the debt ceiling because new spending will be less popular when econ is the center of the media. If he says fiat solves the link, that proves the counter-plan is utopian.

7. Counter-plans must be disclosed on the NDCA wiki. He violates. He has 0 disclosure for Jan/Feb. A. It’s key to reciprocity. I disclosed. B. Key to predictability. I literally have an infinite research burden which outweighs other abuse. C. Key to small school side bias. Otherwise only big schools get flows.

8. Even if he wins each theory shell individually, they are all impact magnifiers to each other. The whole of the abuse is greater than the sum of its parts. Undisclosed unstable delay counterplans without solvency advocates are uniquely bad and a reason to vote neg even if each part is OK on its own. This is an independent shell.

### Politics DA

1-2 Omitted. Generic Ptx answers.

3. TURN – Rehab is popular due to budget cuts. **Gest 10** writes[[27]](#footnote-27)

For many years, criminal justice reform has stagnated in a ideological gridlock, with conservatives seeking harsher punishments and liberals touting prevention and rehabilitation. A big step toward breaking that split occurred 10 days before Christmas, when a group of conservatives did the extraordinary, admitting that they may have been wrong on some aspects of anticrime policy and seeking consensus on key issues. A new group called Right on Crime urged looking at the money spent on criminal justice and its effectiveness. "For too long, conservatives have allowed more money and more prisons to be the default solution to our public safety challenges," said   
Brooke Rollins of the Texas Public Policy Foundation, which is leading a national movement to change the conversation on crime and justice. Rollins spoke at an unusual session in Washington, D.C., that featured not only **conservative leader**s like Grover **Norquist** of Americans for Tax Reform, David Keene of the American Conservative Union, and Pat Nolan of Prison Fellowship but also invited guests from liberal groups like the Open Society Institute, Families Against Mandatory Minimums, and the Drug Policy Alliance. Now the question is whether the group's new statement of six principles can take hold in conservative ranks as well as be embraced by liberals. Removing crime as a divisive political issue may happen, at least for now, in an era of relatively more concern in the United States over issues of the economy, health care, and foreign wars. At the launch of the Right on Crime campaign, Norquist **said most modern** political **candidates realize that crime "isn't the magic button** they once thought it was" **to paint competitors as "soft" on criminals.** Conservatives generally favor less government, but they agree that criminal justice, along with national defense, are legitimate functions of government. Instead of "shouting at each other," he said, those on both ends of the ideological spectrum should work to make sure that taxpayers' money devoted to criminal justice is spent wisely. 'How do we keep the public safe on limited budgets?" asked Nolan. "This is an issue that will unite the left and the right." In a commentary marked by strong rhetoric, **Nolan called the** conservative **group**'s emergence a "seismic shift" and **a "game changer."** The group's leaders indicated that just about major criminal justice policy could be examined, from law enforcement to courts to prisons and sentencing to crime victims' rights. Right on Crime also is concerned with "overcriminalization," the tendency of government at all levels to try making every conceivable offense to society into a crime. One result is filling prisons and jails and sometimes having "the unintended consequence of hardening nonviolent, low-risk offenders--making them a greater risk to the public than when they entered." Right on Crime certainly has intellectual heft. Besides those who spoke this week, such notables as former House Speaker Newt Gingrich, former Attorney General Edwin Meese, one-time hardline criminologist John DiIulio of the University of Pennsylania, and former Republican Justice Department official Viet Dinh are among those who have signed on. The group has more than rhetoric to back up its principles. Led by a Texas think tank, it touts the example of **Texas**, a former leader in prison building that **has turned to** spending money instead on **rehab**ilitative approaches and still has seen its crime rate drop. In brief, the immediate goal of Right on Crime is to export the Texas model to other states. A few states already have embraced elements of it, notably Kansas and South Carolina. This could be the right time to press for reforms, because **a wave of Republican** governors is about to take over in **states** that **are hard pressed for** public **funds.** Already, Gov.-elect John Kasich of **Ohio**, a former conservative leader in Congress, has said that sentencing policies are on the table in his state, which **spends a large chunk of its budget on c**riminal **j**ustice functions.

4. Counter-plan links to politics. Even if the CP passes after the bill, it would get discussed before.

5. My advantages turn the DA and prove now is key. If we improve the economy and solve crime, politicians will be less likely to be divisive over the debt ceiling.

6. Obama PC Not Key for the debt ceiling.

**Pace, 4/8:**

(Obama Second Term Agenda On The Line. Julie Pace, Journalist For The Huffington Post. 4/8/2013)

But **Obama's advisers know the window for broad legislative victories is narrower for a second-term president. Political posturing is already underway for the 2014 midterm elections, which will consume Congress next year. And once those votes for a new Congress are cast, Washington's attention turns to the race to succeed Obama. Patrick Griffin, who served as White House legislative director under President Bill Clinton, said Obama's legislative efforts this year are likely to be the "sum and substance" of his second-term agenda. "I think it would be very tough to put another item on the agenda on his own terms," said Griffin, adding that unexpected events could force other issues to the fore.**

7. Debt Ceiling Won’t Pass; Obama sucks at leverage.

**Hooper, 4/26:**

(Molly K. Hooper, Journalist For The Hill. 4/26/2013. GOP Angst Grows Over Leadership Fumbles)

Rep. Tom Cole (R-Okla.), a deputy whip, said pulling the Pitts bill would not harm the GOP in the debt talks. “I personally think it will be part of a different dynamic. It’s not likely to be a stand-alone vote in my view. If it is**, it most certainly will not pass,”** Cole said. The former head of the National Republican Congressional Committee conceded that he did not know the leadership’s strategy on the debt limit. **Obama launched his bipartisan charm offensive last month, but it has not yet yielded tangible results. The chances of a grand bargain on taxes and entitlements in the coming months are less than 50-50. That political reality will likely lead to a smaller deal, which in some ways is harder to reach.**
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